## Exhibit B

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	
5	Plaintiff, Criminal Action No. 17-10063-DJC V.
6	November 29, 2017
7	PETER LOBO, 2:01 p.m.
8	Defendant.
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENISE J. CASPER
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14	JOHN J. MOAKLEY U.S. COURTHOUSE
15	1 COURTHOUSE WAY
16	BOSTON, MA 02210
17	
18	
19	
20	DEDDA M. TOYCH, DMD, GDD, HGDD
21	DEBRA M. JOYCE, RMR, CRR, FCRR Official Court Reporter
22	John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Room 5204
23	Boston, MA 02210 joycedebra@gmail.com
24	
25	

APPEARANCES: 1 2 FOR THE GOVERNMENT: THEODORE B. HEINRICH, ESQ. 3 United States Attorney's Office John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse 4 1 Courthouse Way Suite 9200 5 Boston, MA 02210 617-748-3245 6 7 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 8 STYLIANUS SINNIS, ESQ. Federal Public Defender Office District of Massachusetts 9 51 Sleeper Street 5th Floor 10 Boston, MA 02210 617-223-8061 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 23 24 25

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (The following proceedings were held in open 3 court before the Honorable Denise J. Casper, United States 4 District Judge, United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, at the John J. Moakley United States Courthouse, 5 6 1 Courthouse Way, Boston, Massachusetts, on November 29. 7 The defendant, Peter Lobo, is present with counsel. 8 The Assistant U.S. Attorney is present.) THE CLERK: Court is in session. Please be seated. 9 02:01 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Mr. Sinnis, I understand there may be an elevator 11 12 issue. 13 Maybe it's been resolved. Okay. 14 MR. SINNIS: Thank you, your Honor. 15 (Discussion off the record.) THE CLERK: Criminal action 17-10063, United States v. 16 17 Peter Lobo. 18 Would counsel please state your name for the record. 19 MR. HEINRICH: Good afternoon. Ted Heinrich for the 02:02 20 government. 21 THE COURT: Good afternoon, counsel. 22 MR. SINNIS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Stelio 23 Sinnis for Mr. Lobo. 24 THE COURT: Good afternoon, counsel.

Good afternoon, sir.

Counsel, Mr. Lobo, I know we're here for sentencing. 1 Before we begin, I want to make sure I have all of the written 2 materials you wanted me to review. 3 I've received and reviewed the presentence report as 4 revised November 27th. I've received Mr. Sinnis' memo on 5 behalf of Mr. Lobo filed November 22nd, including some exhibits 6 and some letters of support. I believe those are all the 7 written materials I have, counsel; is that correct 8 MR. HEINRICH: That's correct your Honor. 9 MR. SINNIS: Your Honor, if I may hand up one more 02:02 10 I notice in some of the cases that I have cited a 11 reference to a DEA intelligence report that dealt with the 12 purity levels of methamphetamine. So I provided a copy to 13 Mr. Heinrich. Specifically, when I do address it, it will be 14 15 on page 4. .THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 16 Counsel, just to begin with the presentence report. 17 Mr. Sinnis, have you reviewed that with your client, 18 Mr. Lobo? 19 MR. SINNIS: Yes, your Honor. 02:03 20 THE COURT: And in regards to the guidelines 21 calculations and the Criminal History Category calculation, I 22 don't believe there were objections from either side; is that 23 correct? 24 Mr. Sinnis? 25

1 MR. SINNIS: That's correct, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Heinrich? 3 MR. HEINRICH: Correct, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Heinrich, is the government's position 5 that Mr. Lobo has satisfied the safety valve? 6 MR. HEINRICH: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So with that said, and having reviewed the calculation in the presentence report, I will 8 9 adopt the adjusted total offense level reflecting the safety valve of 31, a Criminal History Category of I, which I believe 02:04 10 11 then leads to an advisory guideline sentencing range of 108 to 12 135 months, supervised release range of one to three years, a 13 fine range of \$30,000 to \$1 million, and a special assessment 14 of \$100. 15 Counsel, was there any forfeiture sought here by the 16 government? 17 MR. HEINRICH: That's not an issue here, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Counsel, just give me one moment. 19 (Pause.) 02:04 20 THE COURT: And I'm correct that there isn't a minimum 21 mandatory sentence here? 22 MR. HEINRICH: That's correct, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 2.4 Counsel, I will hear your respective recommendations. 25 Mr. Heinrich.

MR. HEINRICH: Thank you, your Honor.

02:06 20

02:05 10

The government officially recommends a sentence at the low end of the guideline range, that would be 108 months or nine years' imprisonment. That's not without its ambiguities, and there's certainly -- if the Court steps back and looks at the factors of this case, I think there are at least some factors that the Court may want to consider in terms of determining an appropriate sentence.

First, I'll say that I think it's apparent to the Court that this was what you might call a quick hit, an efficient prosecution and investigation for that matter.

The downside of that is that this wasn't a typical lengthy federal investigation where you might have a lot of the background information that would assist the Court in assessing Mr. Lobo's character and his culpability in this offense.

Certainly we know that he could produce in his sole possession \$32,000 worth of crystal meth on relatively short order. We may realistically infer that he -- that this was not his only offense and that he was well connected. But beyond that, we don't really know a whole lot and we're left to speculate, and the Court certainly doesn't want to ground a sentence on speculation.

THE COURT: What do you say to your brother's argument in the sentencing memo that it actually took him some time between I think the initial conversations with the undercover

in July and then the final -- what's the consummation I think in two transactions in December.

MR. HEINRICH: About that I would just point out to the Court that after July, based on the parallel investigation that was going on in San Diego, Massachusetts agents were asked to back down, and they actually related that to Mr. Lobo. So part of that, you know, at least until the meetings in October, November, was a consequence of the DEA telling Mr. Lobo that things were on hold.

There was some delay during the periods in October,
November on into the actual transactions in December, but I
personally don't view that as anything other than the typical
drug business, where there are starts, stops, and starts,
particularly where you're dealing with this amount of pure
substance, doesn't strike me as anything out of the ordinary.

THE COURT: Mr. Heinrich, if the government had evidence that Mr. Lobo was otherwise on the radar screen of law enforcement, I assumed I would have heard about it.

MR. HEINRICH: Well, I don't want to taint your Honor, and I don't want to mischaracterize anything, but I also don't want to mislead your Honor.

Mr. Lobo has been on law enforcement's radar screen. He has not been able to be successfully investigated until now. Part of the reason that they sort of did this quick hit was because they had been unsuccessful in the past. I don't think

02:07 10

02:08 20

2.4

02:10 20

02:09 10

any of those past investigations had provided the government with information that would assist the Court in assessing Mr. Lobo. So on the one hand, the Court is right, if we had concrete information, you would have heard about it. I can't say that he wasn't on law enforcement's radar screen.

A couple of other factors that the Court may wish to consider.

I actually was struck by counsel's argument on the disparity or the relatively harsh treatment on methamphetamine. Methamphetamine, particularly crystal meth or very pure methamphetamine, is certainly a dangerous drug, and more particularly out west. In the east, heroin and then particularly fentanyl, are the primary dangerous drugs that are really driving the opioid crisis and causing the most danger, disruption, death. But I think those three are fairly characterized as very dangerous drugs. It surprised me to see that crystal methamphetamine was treated more harshly than even fentanyl, which is preeminently the most dangerous drug threat facing this district.

If it had been a comparable amount of fentanyl, the base offense level would have been four levels lower and the guideline range would have been in the neighborhood of six to seven years rather than nine to 11. So I think that that's a fair factor to take into account.

The only other factors that I would mention are  ${\tt I}$ 

1 think Mr. Sinnis is right to emphasize the defendant's age. 2 think it is --3 THE COURT: Fifty-four. 4 MR. HEINRICH: Makes it less likely that after a 5 significant sentence he will be able to re-establish his 6 criminal conduct. 7 There was no evidence of violence. 8 And I do think that it's worth reemphasizing Mr. Lobo 9 made no bones about the fact that he was caught, caught fairly, 02:11 10 and would be pleading guilty in this case. And it did not 11 require the government to expend any additional evidence beyond customary discovery in order to bring this case on Mr. Lobo's 12 13 part to a resolution. So for all those reasons, although I don't think that 14 15 the defendant's recommendation is a reasonable one, I do think 16 that the Court would not be unreasonable in considering a 17 degree of mercy for Mr. Lobo based on all the facts and 18 circumstances. 19 I'd be happy to answer any questions the Court may 02:11 20 have. 21 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 22 Mr. Sinnis. 23 MR. SINNIS: Thank you very much, your Honor. 24 I think I'd like to talk about three things but start 25 with the guideline because I share Mr. Heinrich's shock,

1.1

2.4

02:13 20

02:12 10

really, at where the guideline ended up. I think part of that is because we don't see methamphetamine cases in this district. Thirteen years at the Federal Defender's Office, and in all candor, this is my first methamphetamine case. So I hadn't had opportunity to kind of focus on that guideline, and when I did, I was struck by it. And I guess I would address my argument to two different points of the guideline, one is the issue of the purity, and the other is the issue of excessiveness.

As I pointed out in my memorandum, the Sentencing Commission in application note 27(C) talks about purity being some sort of a marker for culpability in the sense of potentially being higher up on the chain of distribution. And I think what I saw in the cases that I found from districts where methamphetamine is a much more common drug, such as New Mexico, Idaho, and some of the other cases I point out, is judges are starting to take a very skeptical view of that because they are seeing just in their courtrooms that the purity of methamphetamine now is pretty much unadulterated.

I apologize for not giving this to the Court or Mr. Heinrich before today, but I did notice in preparing for today that one of the courts cited the DEA intelligence report, and it's remarkable, quite frankly, that in this -- this is page 4 of the chart that I handed up to your Honor.

THE COURT: I have it.

MR. SINNIS: -- that in 2007, all methamphetamine

confiscated by the DEA during undercover operations had a 38.7 percent purity; and as of 2013, the last year they did the STRIDE report, it was 94 percent purity. So under the guidelines, anything above an 80 percent purity is treated significantly more harshly than something below 80 percent, and now what you're finding is that purity is simply what it is today.

THE COURT: Meaning -- right. Meaning that most meth on the market is pure.

MR. SINNIS: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SINNIS: And I would go as far as to say not just most, virtually all is what you're hearing. In the case of — in the <u>Hartle</u> case out of Idaho, the judge there cites a 2015-2016 survey of all meth cases in the District of Idaho, and the purity level was 92.6 percent. So basically any assumption or anything of value to be gleaned from the guidelines' view that purity signifies a more significant role I think is undercut by that.

And if you were to take the purity enhancement, for lack of a better word, out of this case, what you would have is a guideline range of 70 to 87 months if you looked at it from the mixture analysis of methamphetamine, which I think I discuss in my memorandum. I tried to do it by a chart, because I find that easier.

02:14 10

2.2

02:15 20

So that's on page 11.

1.8

02:16 20

02:16 10

His range would be 70 to 87 months.

So I do think that the Court should consider that aspect of it.

And then, secondly, I think is just the general excessive nature of the methamphetamine guideline. It stunned me that it's 100 times more severely punished than cocaine. So to get where he is now under the guidelines, Mr. Lobo would have had to sell 150 kilos of cocaine to get to the starting point of a level 36. Or he would have — it's 20 times more severely punished, as Mr. Heinrich pointed out, than heroin. So he would have had to sell 30 kilos of heroin to get to this level. Again, I think there's a general excessiveness to that.

You know, the cases that I cite in my memo, the judges seem to be kind of taking two different positions, either discounting for purity down to the mixture level, or discounting the guideline in some percentage way. I think it was the <u>Hayes</u> case where the judge discounted the guideline by 33 percent, which basically brings you to the same point as the mixture level, which is 70 to 87 months.

I kind of equate this — and I didn't put this in my memo, and I don't know what your Honor's practice is because I haven't actually had any types of these cases with your Honor, but many of your colleagues in possession of child pornography cases kind of create what some of them have referred to as a

shadow guideline, which takes out the use of a computer, takes 1 2 out the number of images, takes out --3 Which I've done in some regard. THE COURT: MR. SINNIS: Okay. 4 THE COURT: 5 At least as to the use of computers, 6 counsel. 7 MR. SINNIS: So I know Judge O'Toole, Judge Saylor, Judge Hillman, which I've had personal experience in front of, 8 9 have created this what Judge O'Toole calls a shadow guideline, 02:17 10 and sentences kind of as a starting point off of that. 11 So I guess my view here is that this guideline calls 12 for kind of a similar approach from your Honor, and I would 13 think that the shadow guideline would be here more the mixture or if it was the equivalent of heroin, say, so that would bring 14 us to a 70 to 87 range, which I think as a starting point 15 really is a much more reasonable position for someone of 16 17 Mr. Lobo's age, lack of criminal history, potential future 18 recidivism. I think the 70 to 87 range as opposed to the 108 19 to 135 is a more reasonable starting point. 02:18 20 So I would ask your Honor to consider that very 21 strongly with regard to the methamphetamine guideline. 22 Second of all, and I lay it out in my memorandum, I 23 don't feel I need to belabor it here, I agree with Mr. Heinrich -- and I didn't mean to mislead anybody -- that 24 25 that July to kind of October, I think it's early October time

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

25

02:20 20

02:19 10

period, there seems to be kind of radio silence there in the discovery materials that the government has provided me. There don't seem to be any phone calls or don't seem to be any text messages between Mr. Lobo and the undercover agent involved in this case. But then starting in October, there is extensive communication between Mr. Lobo and that agent, and there are a lot of fits and starts to this endeavor.

I quess the only place I really differ with Mr. Heinrich is what's the view of that? I don't think that's the norm. I think there were a lot of -- there was a lot of delaying of the delivery because of an inability to put his hands on the substance. All of this being said, I mean, it's obviously a serious crime. I'm not trying to downplay that the sale of four pounds of crystal meth is not a very serious crime, it is an exceptionally serious crime, but I think it needs to be put in the context of how the crime was committed and also how that is viewed vis-a-vis other controlled substances which do very similar harm to members of the community. That's one of the reasons I -- I know that chart was a little more garbled but I tried to pull that cite with regard to emergency room visits and things of that nature with regard to amphetamines being less treated in that capacity than heroin and/or cocaine.

So I do think that the nature of the offense itself is also a reason for your Honor to consider a substantially lower

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:22 20

02:21 10

sentence than where the guideline range comes out in this case.

And then, finally, and of equal significance, is

Mr. Lobo himself. You've read the letters. You see the people
here today who are all here supporting him. His three sons are
here, his long-time friend and former partner, Maureen, is
here, many other friends and family are here. He has two
younger children out in California who obviously were not able
to be here, two daughters.

And, you know, his life has kind of been different There is that initial horrific tragedy of his first wife passing away when the boys are quite young. I think the youngest was two. And she passed away. And then he rebuilt another life with Maureen, who in everything but legal terms adopted those boys, and she is their mother until this day, and she is a big part of Mr. Lobo's life until this day. went to California, lived there for a considerable period of time and married Irma and had two daughters, but fell on hard times. You know, what's not in this PSR, unfortunately, because the Probation Department, for a good reason, only goes back ten years, is that he had a very successful career for a long time being a project manager building outlet stores for Tommy Hilfiger and other companies, and he did that for a very long period of time.

THE COURT: So that's before two thousand -- MR. SINNIS: Before 2007, your Honor.

When did you stop there?

THE DEFENDANT: 2005.

MR. SINNIS: 2005.

And he fell on some hard times in California. His oldest son Peter came to live with him roughly in 2014 and spent about two years with him and the two girls, and they all lived together. And then Peter returned to the East Coast roughly three months before this sale was consummated, and that put Mr. Lobo in a much worse financial position because, quite frankly, Peter, Jr. was helping support Mr. Lobo and the girls.

But as a 54-year-old man who, even under the sentence we're recommending, will be under some federal supervision until 61, I think the risk of recidivism is exceedingly low, if not zero. So to me, it really is a matter of what is the just punishment for this offense? Out of all the criteria that your Honor is supposed to focus on, I think that is the one that comes into play. And I simply just feel very strongly that anything even in the neighborhood of the 108 months is much more than is necessary in this particular case under these particular facts, and I would urge your Honor to use as a starting point the 70- to 87-month range, and then I think there are very valid reasons to go even lower than that.

And so I would urge you to adopt our recommendation of 42 months, followed by three years of supervision. Obviously I would ask that you not impose a fine. I don't think the

02:22 10

02:23 20

```
1
          government is seeking a fine. And I think that's a fair and
          reasonable sentence given all of the factors of this case, your
      2
      3
          Honor.
      4
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay.
      5
                   (Pause.)
                   THE COURT: I'm sorry, I just paused for a moment.
     6
     7
                   Mr. Heinrich, would Mr. Lobo be supervised out of this
     8
          court?
                  Is that what's anticipated?
     9
                   MR. SINNIS: Yes.
02:24 10
                   MR. HEINRICH: Yes.
    11
                   MR. SINNIS: I think he's asking to stay here
    12
          following his release, yes.
                   THE COURT: Okay.
    13
    14
                   My apologies, Mr. Lobo. I'll hear you now.
    15
                   THE DEFENDANT: First, I'd like to say I accept
         responsibility for what I've done. And the remorse I have, I
    16
    17
         live with it every day, and I want to apologize to my family
    18
         for what I've done. I can't do anymore.
    19
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
02:25 20
                   Mr. Lobo, I appreciate the statement. I'll consider
         that along with all of the other evidence I have in the record.
    21
    22
                   Counsel, Mr. Lobo, I'm going to take a recess.
    23
                   I just would ask -- I see Probation represented here.
    24
         My recollection is -- I'm not sure I've had any or if I've had
    25
         any meth cases, they've been few and far between. Are there
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:26 20

average stats on those sentences? Are they just so few and far between in this district that we don't know what they are? PROBATION OFFICER: Off the top of my head there's only one or two cases I can think of. I don't know about the number of cases. There's not much --THE COURT: Counsel, since I've asked Probation that question, Mr. Sinnis, do you know the answer to that question? MR. SINNIS: What I can tell your Honor, we do keep a sentencing database at the Federal Defender's Office with regard to, as best as we can, almost all sentences that are imposed. And I did search that, and what I came up with was roughly 12 methamphetamine cases that have been sentenced in this district. I believe five of them were co-defendant cases in front of Judge Young, and the sentences varied -- and I wasn't able -- varied greatly from kind of in the 24-month up to like 151-month range, but I'm only able to access certain amounts of information. So it was hard for me to glean anything. But there's just -- I will say I did not find any case in our database, any methamphetamine case that your Honor had sentenced. THE COURT: Mr. Heinrich, anything to add on that point? MR. HEINRICH: Not much. I've had one other methamphetamine case. It was very different than this.

involved a person trying to make his own methamphetamine.

I do remember one case, and it's probably the case before Judge Young, that was a significant meth case, but I don't remember the sentences that were imposed.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'll take a brief recess and come back to the bench. Thank you.

THE CLERK: All rise.

(Recess taken.)

THE COURT: Counsel, Mr. Lobo, I appreciate counsel's arguments and responses to my questions today.

As I said, Mr. Lobo, I've also considered your statement and the letters I received from your former partner and your children, along with all of the other information I have in the record here.

Mr. Lobo, as you may understand, to determine the appropriate and reasonable sentence here, I need to consider a number of factors, not just the advisory guideline sentencing range that you've heard me discuss with counsel, but the nature and circumstances of the crime that you committed and your personal history and background, as well as the need for any sentence I impose to reflect the seriousness of that offense; promote respect for the law, not just by you, but by others as well; provide just punishment and adequate deterrence, again, not just for you, but for others; and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities; all of the factors under Title 18, United States Code 3553(a).

02:37 10

02:37 20

02:39 20

02:38 10

Mr. Lobo, I'm not going to repeat everything that Mr. Heinrich and Mr. Sinnis have referenced in the course of this hearing or everything that was reflected in your presentence report, but I do want to mention a few things.

First, obviously, I've considered the crime that you've committed here and for which you've accepted responsibility: distribution and possession with intent to distribute crystal methamphetamine. It's not disputed that you sold four pounds to an undercover agent in the course of I believe it was two transactions in December. There was some early meetings with the undercover agent, but the consummation of those came later on.

Certainly, as I think Mr. Sinnis acknowledges on your behalf, this is a serious crime. I know from at least one of the letters that one of your family members sent to me, I think drug addiction has, sadly, touched your own family, so I don't have to lecture to you about the harms and the dangers caused by drug distribution.

I've also considered not just the crime that you committed here, but also your personal history.

I know that you're -- I believe, if I'm recalling correctly, you're 54 years old. You were born in New Bedford. You lived in New Bedford for a while, then Dartmouth, Massachusetts, and then at some point you lived outside of state when you were attending college in the south, and

eventually found your way to California.

. 7

- 8

- 9

11.

02:41 20

02:40 10

You yourself growing up had what was, by your own description, a stable and intact family. You have several siblings. I think your parents and your siblings live in the Massachusetts area, if I'm recalling correctly.

As one of your sons recounted in his letter to me, and as Mr. Sinnis referenced today, sadly, your first wife passed away when your three sons were young, and you were on your own for a time. You did end up remarrying. In addition to the three boys who are in their 20s, I'm also aware that you have two young daughters, 11 and 13, both of whom wrote to me on your behalf.

I understand you're a high school graduate. You did not receive a college degree but did attend college for a few years.

As of 2016, leading up to your arrest in California, as I've heard on your behalf, you hit some rough times financially speaking. Earlier in your life you had had a successful career and job as a project manager, and then for a time I think you sold cars for resale in Mexico and had more recently a series of odd jobs in construction and also with cars.

I also understand from the presentence report you yourself have struggled with drug use, most recently with cocaine, and I think Probation recommends that you be

recommended for the Residential Drug Treatment Program while you're incarcerated, which I think is an appropriate recommendation.

I've certainly considered the circumstances, financial circumstances, in which you found yourself, which appears to coincide with your involvement in the transaction that leads you here and for which you are charged.

I've also noted what I think both sides describe as not just your acceptance of responsibility, but your prompt -- your prompt and early acceptance of responsibility which I have considered.

In terms of your criminal history, you don't have a criminal history, and you've not — at least by my memory, have not served any periods of incarceration prior to your detention in this matter.

Third, Mr. Lobo, I've considered the advisory guideline sentencing range of 108 to 135 months. You've heard the government recommends a sentence at the low end of that range of 108 months. Mr. Sinnis recommends a sentence significantly lower than that on your behalf.

I think, as Mr. Heinrich recognizes, the argument Mr. Sinnis makes on your behalf in regards to what the appropriate range should be is persuasive to me. I will say I did consider the materials that were attached to the sentencing guidelines, and I did have a chance to also consider the chart

02:42 10

. 8

that Mr. Sinnis produced today. That is, that, Mr. Lobo, to the extent there was an enhancement because of the purity of the methamphetamine, which now appears to be the market standard, I don't think that enhancement or that further enhancement is appropriate here. And I do think the more reasonable range for me to consider is the 70- to 87-month range, which reflects the range for a mixture including methamphetamine. So I'll consider that as the appropriate advisory guideline sentencing range.

Finally, Mr. Lobo, I've considered all of the goals of sentencing that I've referred to before, not just the seriousness of your offense and the need for there to be a just punishment, but also the need for deterrence. Although methamphetamine is not a drug that we often see in this district, or at least in my experience, I don't think there's any dispute that the dangers from meth use or from the dangers, likewise, from the distribution of methamphetamine.

I do think it's appropriate, however, in considering the low end of the adjusted guideline sentencing range that I also consider that that range does reflect the affect of the safety valve and your criminal history but not all of the other mitigating factors which I think both sides recognize, given your age and the likelihood of recidivism by you, and what I would call aberrant behavior here and early acceptance of responsibility.

02:43 10

02:44 20

For all of these reasons, I think a substantial 1 sentence, but not one in the range of 108 months, is 2 3 appropriate. For all of these reasons, I'm going to impose a 4 sentence of 60 months of incarceration, three years of 5 supervised release, no fine, but the mandatory special 6 7 assessment of \$100. I do think, Mr. Lobo, given all that's before me, this 8 is a sufficient sentence, but not one greater than necessary, 9 to achieve all of the goals of sentencing that I've mentioned. 02:45 10 Counsel, anything that you need to be heard on before 11 I formally impose sentence? 12 Mr. Heinrich? 13 MR. HEINRICH: No, your Honor, thank you. 14 MR. SINNIS: Just two things, your Honor. One you 15 reminded me of, which we would be asking for the RDAP 16 recommendation; and two, your Honor, I don't know if your Honor 17 does make judicial recommendations in terms of placements, but 18 we would ask for the camp at Fort Devens, obviously based upon 19 the Bureau's consideration of other security factors, but that 02:46 20 would be our recommendation. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Heinrich, do you need to be heard? 22 MR. HEINRICH: No, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Counsel, in addition, I just want to -- I 24 know in the presentence report there were recommendations as to 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:47 20

02:46 10

certain special conditions, this is on page 23 of the presentence report. Counsel, I'm inclined to adopt these. These are numbered 1 through 4. Do you need to be heard on any of these? Mr. Heinrich? MR. HEINRICH: No, your Honor. (Pause.) MR. SINNIS: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Lobo, I'd ask you to rise so I can formally impose sentence. Mr. Lobo, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, and as I've said, having considered the factors under Title 18, United States Code, 3553(a), it is the judgment of this Court that you're hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a period of 60 months. I shall make the recommendations that Mr. Sinnis has asked me to on your behalf. I'll recommend that you be housed at Devens, the federal facility at Devens, to the extent that it's consistent with your Criminal History Category or security classification. As you might already understand from your counsel, that is a decision that BOP has to make, but I will make the recommendation that they house you there. I will also make a recommendation that you participate in any vocational training that's available at the BOP facility.

I will also recommend that you participate in the RDAP 1 2 program. And I'd also make a recommendation that once you're 3 released, Mr. Lobo, that you participate in this court's CARE 4 program. Mr. Sinnis can advise you about that program, if 5 you're interested. It's a voluntary program, but it does 6 assist with reentry, and I urge you to seriously consider 7 participating. 8 Upon your release from imprisonment, Mr. Lobo, you'll 9 be placed on a period of supervised release for a term of three 02:48 10 11 years. Within 72 hours of your release from BOP custody you 12 shall report in person to the district in which you are 13 1.4 released. I'm not imposing a fine since I find, based on the 15 presentence report, you don't have the ability to pay one. 16 During your supervised release you must comply with 17 the mandatory and standard conditions of supervision that will 18 be reflected in my judgment. 19 Mr. Sinnis, will Mr. Lobo waive the reading of those? 02:48 20 MR. SINNIS: Yes, your Honor. 21 As to the special conditions, these are THE COURT: 22 also conditions you must comply with, Mr. Lobo. 23 During your term of supervised release you're 24 prohibited from drinking alcohol to the point of intoxication, 25

1 which is defined under Mass. law as .10. 2 You must participate in any program for substance 3 abuse counseling or any vocational services, training program 4 as may be directed by Probation. You shall be required, based on your ability to pay or 5 the availability of third-party payment, to pay for these 6 7 treatment programs. 8 As to any substance abuse counseling, that may include 9 random drug testing, not to exceed 104 drug tests per year. 02:49 10 I also order that you pay the \$100 mandatory special assessment, which shall be due immediately. 11 12 Mr. Lobo, that will be the judgment of the Court, and you can be seated. Thank you. 13 14 Counsel, other than advising Mr. Lobo of his appellate 15 rights, anything else that I need to take up? 16 MR. HEINRICH: No, your Honor. 17 MR. SINNIS: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Lobo, I need to advise you that you 19 can appeal your conviction if you believe your guilty plea was 02:50 20 unlawful or involuntary or there's some other fundamental 21 defect in the proceeding that was not waived by your quilty 22 plea. You also have the right to appeal the sentence I've just

If you're unable to pay the costs of appeal, you may ask permission to have those costs waived and appeal without

23

24

25

imposed.

1 paying. You must file any notice of appeal within 14 days of 2 the entry of my written judgment. 3 If you request, the clerk of this court will 4 immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf. 5 Do you understand, sir? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Sir, I do wish you good luck. You have a 8 strong support system which I don't often see for defendants, 9 and I hope you rely on it in making good choices and wise 02:50 10 11 choices in the future. 12 Thank you. MR. SINNIS: Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE CLERK: All rise. 14 (Court adjourned at 2:51 p.m.) 15 16 CERTIFICATION 17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 18 of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to 19 the best of my skill and ability. 20 21 22 23 December 22, 2017 24 /s/Debra M. Joyce Debra M. Joyce, RMR, CRR, FCRR Date 25 Official Court Reporter